

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/727,613	12/05/2003	Naoyuki Takahashi	31721-198597	31721-198597 9104	
26694	7590 01/20	006	EXAMINER		
VENABLE LLP P.O. BOX 34385			SONG, MATTHEW J		
	ON, DC 20045-9	98	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
	ŕ		1722	,=,, , =, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application N	0.	Applicant(s)			
	10/727,613		TAKAHASHI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit			
	Matthew J. So	<u> </u>	1722			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the co	ver sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	idress		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS R 1.136(a). In no event, h ariod will apply and will explatatute, cause the application	COMMUNICATION owever, may a reply be timing SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONE	I. sely filed the mailing date of this c O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	2/5/2003.					
, ,	This action is non-	final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	•—					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 8-22 is/are pending in the applica 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 8-17 and 19-22 is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 18 is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	drawn from consic					
Application Papers				•		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
	i					
	•		•			
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	41	Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
 Notice of Neterences Cited (PTO-092) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SE Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/5/03. 	3/08) 5)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da		O-152)		

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claim 8, 13, 14, 17, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka et al (US 5,879,811).

Tanaka et al discloses a method of forming a thin film comprising an oxide single crystal having a quartz crystal structure, this reads on applicant's epitaxial film, (col 2, ln 10-62) on a single crystal substrate of an oxide, such as quartz, sapphire (col 5, ln 10-20) or a silicon single crystal substrate (Examples 6-7). Tanaka et al also discloses a vapor phase deposition for producing an silicon dioxide thin film having a quartz crystal structure at atmospheric pressure using metal alkoxides, such as, Si(OCH₃)₄, Si(OCH₃)₄ or Si(OC₃H₇)₄ (col 7, ln 1-65), where these metal alkoxides read on applicant's tetramethoxysilane, tetraethoxysilane and tetrapropoxysilane, respectively. Tanaka et al also discloses the raw material gas must be mixed with oxidizing gas, such as oxygen, this reads on applicant's reacting the source of silicon with oxygen to deposit a quartz film on the substrate.

Referring to claim 13, Tanaka et al discloses depositing quartz.

Referring to claim 14, Tanaka et al discloses a sapphire substrate (col 5, ln 1-20).

Referring to claim 17, Tanaka et al discloses a X ray diffraction profile exhibiting a diffraction peat at $2\theta=50.6^{\circ}$ in Fig 1, Fig 4 and Fig 5 for quartz.

Referring to claim 19, Tanaka et al discloses using an inert gas to dilute the mixed gas, this reads on applicant's inert carrier gas.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 12, 15, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al (US 5,879,811).

Tanaka et al discloses all of the limitations of claims 12, 15,16 and 20 as discussed previously, except Tanaka et al does not teach the claimed deposition rate, temperature of silicon, the deposition temperature and partial pressure.

Deposition rate is a result effective variable that can be controlled with source gas flow rate, temperature, and pressure. Temperature and partial pressure is a well known result effective variable. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Tanaka et al to obtain the claimed deposition rate, the claimed temperatures, and claimed partial pressure by conducting routine experimentation of a result effective variable (MPEP 2144.05).

5. Claims 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al (US 5,879,811) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Yamazaki et al (US 2005/01589041 A1).

Tanaka et al discloses all of the limitations of claim 9, as discussed previously, except using a catalyst.

In a method of depositing silicon oxide, note entire reference, Yamazaki et al teaches a silicon oxide film is formed using low pressure CVD, and adding hydrogen chloride, this reads on applicant's catalyst, note claim 10, to the mixed raw material gas ([0030]). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Tanaka et al by adding hydrogen chloride to the atmosphere as taught by Yamazaki et al to prevent natrium contamination ([0031]).

6. Claims 11 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al (US 5,879,811), as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Okano et al (JP 08-110425), an English abstract is provided in the IDS filed 12/5/03, or in view of Tokunaga et al (JP 05-215929), an English abstract is provided in the IDS filed 12/5/03.

Tanaka et al teaches all of the limitations of claim 11, as discussed previously, except

Tanaka et al does not teach a buffer layer.

In a method of forming a optical wave guide, Okano et al teaches a buffer layer 21 is formed on the surface of a Si substrate and a quartz glass film composed of the same composition as the buffer layer is further form on the quartz film (abstract). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Tanaka et al with Okano et al's quartz buffer because warpage is reduced.

In a method of forming a glass waveguide, Tokunaga et al teaches a buffer layer 2 of quartz is formed on a substrate and a pure quartz film 3 is formed on the buffer layer (abstract). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Tanaka et al with Tokunaga et al's buffer layer of quartz to form a glass waveguide with a small transmission loss.

7. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al (US 5,879,811) in view of Okano et al (JP 08-110425), an English abstract is provided in the IDS filed 12/5/03, or in view of Tokunaga et al (JP 05-215929), an English abstract is provided in the IDS filed 12/5/03, as applied to claims 11 and 21 above, and further in view of Ohtani et al (US 5,904,770).

Application/Control Number: 10/727,613 Page 6

Art Unit: 1722

The combination of Tanaka et al and Okano et al or the combination of Tanaka et al and Tokunaga et al teaches all of the limitations of claim 22, as discussed previously, except annealing the film.

In a method of forming a silicon oxide film, note entire reference, Ohtani et al teaches annealing a silicon oxide film, formed by CVD using TEOS and ozone, in oxygen or ozone in a temperature range from 400-600°C for a duration of 30-60 minutes (col 8, ln 1-65). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Tanaka et al and Okano et al or the combination of Tanaka et al and Tokunaga et al by annealing the film, as taught by Ohtani et al, to improve film quality.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 8. Claim 18 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 9. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The closest prior art, Tanaka et al (US 5,879,811) teaches forming a quartz film using TEOS and oxygen gases in a normal pressure CVD process. Tanaka et al does not teach or suggest using a GaN or ZnO buffer layer. The use of a buffer layer with a lattice constant unlike quartz would not have been obvious to person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Conclusion

Application/Control Number: 10/727,613

Art Unit: 1722

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Abe (US 5,146,082) teaches forming quartz using a plasma CVD and tetraethoxysilane,

Page 7

tetramethoxysilane, oxygen, ozone or carbon dioxide as material gases (col 21, ln 1-25).

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Matthew J. Song whose telephone number is 571-272-1468. The examiner

can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Duane Smith can be reached on 571-272-1166. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Matthew J Song

Examiner

Art Unit 1722

MJS

January 8, 2006

DUANE SMITH PRIMARY EXAMINE

1-9-00